

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1-8 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended for clarification purposes only. New claims 9-18 add additional features from the disclosure. Claims 1 and 5 are amended for clarification purposes only.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bickmore *et al.* (EP 0949571 A2). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites an image display method for displaying “description data having text information and image information described in a predetermined description format” including a step of “extracting attribute values from the description data indicating attributes for specifying the image information” and a step of “listing the extracted attribute values”. The cited reference does not teach these limitations.

Instead, Bickmore teaches a document re-authoring system using various transformation techniques, as shown on page 9, paragraph [0068]. However, there is no suggestion that these transformation techniques are extracted from the source document. In contrast, claim 1 specifies that “attribute values” are extracted from the “description data”. In contrast, the transformation techniques used by Bickmore appear to originate with the Bickmore device itself, and are not “extracted” from the source document. Thus, Bickmore does not teach the “extracting” step as recited in claim 1.

Further, there is no teaching by Bickmore that its transformation techniques are “listed”, and there is no indication that Bickmore teaches listing other extracted “attribute values” related to image information, and hence Bickmore further fails to teach the listing step of claim 1.

Consequently, claim 1 is patentable over the reference. Claim 5 has similar limitations as claim 1, and thus claim 5 is patentable over the references for the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 2-4, which depend directly or indirectly on claim 1, and Claims 4-8, which depend directly or indirectly on claim 5, are all patentable over the reference for at least the same reasons.

Finally, the newly added claims contain similar limitations to claims 1 and/or 5, and also contain additional limitations not taught by the reference, and thus new claims 9-18 are also patentable over the reference.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 34102.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By:



Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

March 16, 2004